DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 451 655 EC 308 338

AUTHOR Smith, Anne, Ed.; Doll, Beth, Ed.; Gengel, Stacey, Ed.

TITLE OSERS/OECD International Symposium on Inclusion and Professional Development. Proceedings (Bethesda, MD, September 24-26, 1998).

INSTITUTION Colorado Univ., Denver.; Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris (France). Centre for Educational Research and Innovation.

SPONS AGENCY Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC.; Georgetown Univ. Child Development Center, Washington, DC.

PUB DATE 1998-09-00

NOTE 51p.; Symposium held in Bethesda, Maryland, September 24-26, 1998.

CONTRACT HO29K970103-98

PUB TYPE Collected Works - Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS College School Cooperation; *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Global Approach; *Inclusive Schools; *Partnerships in Education; Postsecondary Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Professional Development; *Regular and Special Education Relationship; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Collaboration; *Teacher Education; Teamwork

ABSTRACT

This report is an outcome of the OSERS/OECD International Symposium on Inclusion and Professional Development held in Bethesda, Maryland, from September 24-26, 1998. The purpose of the symposium was to examine promising professional preparation practices that support the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education curriculum. The following common understandings emerged: (1) better prepared teachers who are more adept at teaching all students will also be adept at inclusion; (2) impending change in schooling will require that general and special education teachers prepare to teach in collaborative teams; (3) demands on educators are shifting rapidly and causing distress, limiting their participation in reform efforts; (4) professional development to support inclusion must involve both pre-service and ongoing professional development; (5) general educators often feel unprepared and ill-equipped to include children with disabilities; (6) students with disabilities and their families must become full partners; (7) educational systems for students with disabilities must be coordinated with community services; (8) school-university partnerships hold the promise of simultaneous renewal; and (9) school-university partnerships have the potential to shift educators' thinking by requiring encounters among people with different roles. The report includes summaries of proceedings and essays on highlighted topics. (Essays include references.) (CR)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original document.

ED 451 655

OSERS/OECD International Symposium on Inclusion and Professional Development

Sponsored by

The U.S. Department of Education
Office of Special Education and
Rehabilitative Services

The Organization for Economic Cooperation
and Development
Center on Educational Research and
Innovation

The Georgetown University Child
Development Center

and

The University of Colorado
at Denver

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EC 308338

Edited by Anne Smith, Beth Doll, and Stacey Gengel

IDEAs that Work
U.S. Office of Special Education Programs

Support
for this symposium and the
production of these proceedings were
provided in part by a grant awarded to the
University of Colorado at Denver by the U.S.
Department of Education, Office of Special Education
and Rehabilitative Services - Grant Award # HO29K970103-98.

Project Director: Beth Doll
Project Officer: Anne Smith

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

Executive Summary		3
Common Understandings		3
Background		5
Participants		6
Symposium Format		6
Focus Questions		7
Synthesis		8
Essays		
Brian McNulty	A District Administrator's Perspective on Supporting Teacher Development	10
Jutta Berndt	What Kinds of Training in Special Education Should Be Provided to General Education Teachers?	11
Sherry Harrison	A Teacher's View of Inclusion	14
Gaetanina Villanella	Teachers and Change	16
Ellen Brantlinger	Perspectives on University Preservice Preparation Programs and School Inclusion	17
Linda Blanton	Necessary Components of Successful Partnership	20
G. Thomas Belamy	Notes on University - School Partnerships	23
Barbara LeRoy	A Michigan Example of Collaborative Partnership for Education Reform and Personnel Preparation	25
Janet Filbin	Preparing Educators for the New Millenium: Creating Responsive and Responsible Partnerships	28
Susan Tetler	Reflections about Ongoing Professional Development of Experienced Teachers for Ensuring Successful Inclusion	30
Yerker Andersson	Representation of People with Disabilities in Educational Policy-Making	33
Yun Xu	How will School Inclusion of Children with Disabilities Affect Others in the Community?	35
External Perspective		39
Critical Questions		40
References		43
Participant List		45

Executive Summary

The OSERS/OECD International Symposium on Inclusion and Professional Development was held in Bethesda, MD, from September 24 to 26, 1998. The purpose of the symposium was to examine, from a global perspective, promising professional preparation practices that support the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education curriculum. The symposium addressed two overarching questions:

- What are the changing roles in general and special education that support inclusive schooling?
- How will different countries prepare educators to participate in inclusive schooling?

Symposium participants came from 24 countries around the world: Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Brazil, Brunei, Canada, China, Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Switzerland, Turkey and the United States.

The discussions of the OSERS/OECD International Symposium are summarized in these nine statements that represent common understandings of symposium participants:

Common Understandings

Common Understandings That Emerged

- Better-prepared teachers who are more adept at teaching all students will also be adept at including students with disabilities in the general curriculum.
- Impending changes in schooling will require that general and special education teachers prepare to teach in cooperative/collaborative teams whose collective instructional competence is the synergistic combination of each member's unique and complimentary skills.
- Demands on general and special education teachers are shifting rapidly and dramatically. The struggle to adjust to this change contributes to teachers' distress and limits their participation in some reform efforts.
- Professional development to support the inclusive education of students with disabilities must involve both pre-service preparation of beginning teachers and ongoing professional development of teachers who are already working in schools.

- General education teachers often feel unprepared, ill-equipped, and unsupported to include children with disabilities in their classrooms, because of the limitations that they identify in their own skills; or the increased complexity of the classroom's needs; or the limited resources they have to meet the additional demands presented by the children. Their hesitance is magnified by historical tendencies for classroom teachers to work independently and for schools to assign complex instructional tasks to "experts" from outside classrooms.

- Students with disabilities and their families must become full and equal partners in decisions related to schooling. Similarly, teacher preparation programs must emphasize more and better communi cation with people with disabilities and their families.

- Educational systems and services for students with disabilities must be coordinated with systems and services provided by other professional and community agencies, particularly medical and mental health services.

- School-university partnerships hold the promise of simultaneous renewal by grounding university teacher preparation programs in the practice of schooling and by providing schools with opportunities to become part of the scholarship and research of university faculty and students.

- School-university partnerships have the potential to shift educators' thinking by requiring encounters among people with different roles and perspectives.

Systemic education reform and school improvement initiatives are global phenomena. Around the world, general and special educators are facing major challenges as they redefine their roles and reform their service-delivery systems to enhance schools' ability to educate learners from increasingly diverse cultural, linguistic, religious, and socio-economic backgrounds. It is clear that the answers to these complex challenges are not to be found in segregating diverse learners into separate categorical programs and using a different curriculum than that of general education.

In nations around the world, strong voices supporting inclusion are resulting in policies and practices to educate students with disabilities in general education settings. Including students with disabilities and other diverse learners in the general education curriculum has far-reaching implications as well as benefits for students, families, schools, communities, and education professionals. Inclusive schooling strategies are being designed and implemented in school settings even while instructional technology and practice recommendations are developing and evolving within personnel preparation programs. The symposium described in these proceedings addressed the unique needs of personnel preparation programs as they adapt to inclusive educational policies.

The OSERS / OECD International Symposium on Inclusion and Professional Development met in Bethesda, MD from September 24 to 26, 1998, immediately following the Fifth International Congress on Serving Children with Disabilities in the Community. This invited symposium examined pre-service preparation of educators and ongoing professional development efforts in the context of global education reforms and the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education curriculum. The symposium's purpose was not to reach definitive answers to these important questions, but to provide a forum for participants to explore the implications and ramifications of including students with disabilities in broad educational reform initiatives. The symposium provided an opportunity for thoughtful discourse, to examine emerging themes, to ascertain common understandings, to identify key issues, and to articulate those questions needing further examination in future conversations.

Participants

Seventy-five participants from 24 countries attended the symposium and represented a broad array of stakeholder perspectives. Participants included people with disabilities; parents and family members of individuals with disabilities; policy-makers; program implementers; teachers, administrators, practitioners, and service providers; researchers and university faculty members; members of professional and other non-governmental organizations involved with education or disability issues; and officials from governmental ministries and agencies across national, state, and provincial levels. The participants were from the following countries:

Argentina	China	Ireland	New Zealand
Armenia	Denmark	Italy	Norway
Australia	France	Japan	Poland
Brazil	Germany	Kuwait	Switzerland
Brunei	Hungary	Mexico	Turkey
Canada	Iceland	Netherlands	United States

Symposium Format

Over three days, symposium participants met in plenary and smaller interactive groups to examine and explore changing roles in general and special education in the milieu of educational reform and school inclusion. Their perspectives were influenced by the educational governance structures of 23 nations and were grounded by influences of culture, language, religion, and socio-economics on school organizational structures, education faculty, and students.

Eight focus questions served as a framework to structure both plenary and small group discussions (See figure 1). Discussions were an ongoing occurrence throughout the meetings, punctuated by large and small group discussions, informal conversations, and written exchanges. Each participant was requested to make a brief presentation addressing one of the focus questions in either plenary or small group sessions. These presentations were followed by lively, interactive exchanges among participants. Facilitators were assigned to the plenary and small group sessions to keep the conversations focused on identified issues and to ensure that all participants had opportunities to contribute to the discussions. A second person recorded key points made by participants on a flip chart, and a third person used a laptop computer to record the conversations. Symposium participants were asked to record their reflections and observations about the conversations on posted chart paper and were invited to write an essay for inclusion in these proceedings.

Professor James Banks served as an invited discussant for the symposium. Dr.

Symposium Format

Banks is a Past President of the American Educational Research Association and of the National Council for the Social Studies. He is a distinguished spokesman on issues related to multicultural education and educating for diversity. As a well-respected educator having minimal involvement with special education, Dr. Banks was asked to provide an external perspective on the symposium's activities, the dialogue among participants and the symposium's implications for the future of education.

Eight Focus Questions

The eight focus questions that guided discussions during the symposium were:

- Given recent systemic reform initiatives, how are general and special education moving toward partnership?
- What are the advantages and disadvantages of current inclusive schooling practices where they are being implemented?
- What skills do school personnel require to meet the needs of students with disabilities?
- How will inclusive schooling practices require school personnel to change roles?
- How do different countries expose their educators to the philosophy of inclusion and the practices that support it?
- What is the potential of school-university partnerships to design and restructure educator personnel preparation training and professional development?
- What are the research, theory, and case studies that inform and support specific approaches to personnel preparation and ongoing professional development?
- What are the policy, research, and practice implications of these complex and interrelated issues?

Following the symposium, the editors examined the chart notes and laptop records to identify emerging themes. From these, the editors drafted summaries of the common understandings reached by symposium participants (listed on pages 3 to 4) and of the critical questions that were identified but remained unanswered (listed on pages 40 to 42). Three months after the symposium, all participants were asked to review summaries of these key understandings and critical questions to ensure their accuracy. Revisions were made to the summaries based on participant feedback. In addition, participants were invited, once again, to write essays describing their thoughts and reflections about the symposium. This brief report includes the following:

- A synthesis of the rich discussions and fluid interchange of ideas among participants.
- Essays by some participants.
- The common understandings as reviewed by participants.
- The critical questions that participants identified to guide and extend future discourse on the preparation of educators to work in inclusive schools.

Synthesis

Participants described a range of policies and practices regarding including students with disabilities in general education. Aida Topuzyan (Turkey) explained how schools are working toward inclusive schooling practices: "Currently most children with special needs attend separate schools. Classroom teachers desire skills to teach children with special needs, and Turkey is working with the World Bank to move forward."

Toshiro Ochiai (Japan) spoke of endeavors to integrate special and general education services. "The problem of integration and inclusion is that we have no policy," he said. "We need to make sense of today's education. Between 9 percent and 10 percent of students in elementary school can't understand their curriculum. We can't leave these children behind."

Helen Berg-Gonzalez (Mexico) noted, "Mexico is in transition from a very traditional system of students seated in rows, etc. We are hoping that looking at these special needs kids will help us to improve education overall. We do believe in a community of learners, and we are trying to have special and regular education work together."

Syed Asghar (U.S.) said, "The greatest impediment in the inclusion process is the attitude of the society. We must try to change the attitude by educating parents, students, teachers, and administrators to be more helpful to bring about changes in the educational system."

Susan Tetler (Denmark) described the origins of this attitude. She explained, "The concept of inclusion is aligned with general education reforms. It is difficult to implement these reforms in classrooms because they challenge the assumptions our schools have been based on for many years. We have a 200-year-old curriculum tradition."

Classroom teacher Gaetanina Villanella (Italy) described a changing political climate. "Since 1992," she said, "the educational system has been fully inclusive, and special schools do not exist any more. Teachers had many fears about including special needs students into mainstream education...yet today, it is OK." Italy's experience was similar to recent educational changes in Brunei.

Lily Khoo (Brunei) explained, "Inclusive education started in 1995. We took regular education teachers and gave them a year and half of training and then spaced the teachers out among schools."

Peter Evans (OECD) aptly summarized the dilemma: "Children become excluded because of our failure to address the needs of children in the first place. Teachers need to be able to recognize quickly when children aren't learning in their classroom. Inclusion is not a question if you can adapt to what children need in the classroom."

Some countries with a more recent history of special education are seeking guidance in the experiences of other nations. Xu Yun (China) observed, "Special education in China has a short history so we don't know which models to follow. Hard-working teachers, but no experience .... We need a message from other countries about why inclusion policy is important."

Much of the discussion centered on the complex nature of establishing partnerships among key stakeholders to support pre-service and ongoing professional development. Gail McGregor (U.S.) observed, "Partnerships are critical to build and support more inclusive schools as well as better teacher training programs. We need to 'break the mold' in thinking about how and when these partnerships occur. Involvement of the faculty and pre-service students in multiple ways throughout the preparation process will lead to greater reciprocity and improve the quality of the partnerships."

Xu Yun (China) offered insights about China's work to coordinate governmental agencies and schools to include students with disabilities. During this process, partnerships were broadened beyond those that had initially been considered. "We need to develop a coordinating committee for people with disabilities and have many agencies involved, especially financial departments, so they can integrate to give money to special education fields," Xu explained. "Partnership is the key."

Judy Winn (U.S.) saw the parallels between the needs of primary school teachers and university faculty, "I think about our university model as I observe novice teachers and see how much trouble they have with collaboration. We need to break the mold of what and how we teach."

Peder Haug (Norway) emphasized the importance of supports for teachers to shift toward inclusive models of schooling, "Our challenge is how to make a suitable adaptation and collaborate within a whole-school approach. What kinds of support shall we give teachers? How do we build support systems to help teachers with teaching and learning problems that schools experience every day?"

"The greatest impediment in the inclusion process is the attitude of the society. We must try to change the attitude by educating parents, students, teachers, and administrators to be more helpful to bring about changes in the educational system."

Syed Asghar (U.S.)

Doug Biklen (U.S.) observed, "Separate tracks are now trying to come together, and the struggle is how we fit these entities together. New perspectives on special education are emerging. These competencies need to become part of general teacher education, not just an adjunct."

Dora Bjarnason (Iceland) added, "Teachers need specific skills to make all kids full, active members, and teachers need practical skills in planning, cooperation, and interaction. Planning is crucial, as is ongoing collaboration. And parents are essential partners."

Jutta Berndt (Germany) emphasized the self-reflective processes of teaching, "It is important to learn and get in the habit of reflecting about all you are doing: listen,

react, reflect. The important task now is learning how to cooperate. The task for teachers is counseling and tutoring by helping others in both vertical and horizontal ways, not only between experts but among all kinds of groups." Symposium participants recognized that effective teachers cannot work in isolation. In changing schools, teachers are increasingly expected to work as one member of a larger instructional team that shares responsibility for the education of groups of students.

A District Administrator's Perspective on Supporting Teacher Development

BRIAN A. MCNULTY / UNITED STATES

Several interrelated personnel training and development issues emerge as we pursue the inclusion of students with disabilities in ongoing school improvement initiatives. Districts need a clearly articulated vision that addresses our shared responsibility for the success of all students. No single person can meet the needs of all students in a building, but collectively we can meet the needs of all students. During this period of rapid change in our educational systems, novice teachers and administrators need a well-developed mentoring induction program. This process should acquaint new personnel with the culture and priorities of the school district. Districts also need an assessment system that provides ongoing evaluation of student progress as an integral component of program accountability.

In addition, districts need to establish an ongoing professional development process for all teachers based on an inquiry model by providing teachers with collective opportunities to look at critical issues related to curriculum and instruction. Teachers need to understand the different learning styles of children and how to use differentiated instructional practices to meet children's varied and unique needs. Ongoing assessment of student progress, fostered by the use of peer coaching and teacher study teams to assist with its interpretation, can assist teachers to become more deliberate and reflective in their thinking. It is essential that district professional development models provide information, demonstrations, guided practice and opportunities for teachers to rehearse new strategies and engage in extended dialogue around their practice. We refer to this as the "Ninety-Ten Principle" in which 10 percent of time is spent in presenting information, demonstrating this information, and providing guided practice, while 90 percent of time is spent on practice, peer coaching, teacher study groups, and ongoing action research related to the topic.

As R. Gonggrijp (Netherlands) pointed out, teacher collaboration is fundamental to effective inclusive schooling programs. "Teachers can't teach alone. If different teachers have different specialties and work together, maybe they can meet the needs of students with disabilities."

Susan Tetler (Denmark) added, "No teacher can be so skilled that he or she can work in isolation. On the contrary, what is needed in order to meet the challenge of student diversity is teamwork, where the special education qualifications are considered part of the joint qualifications of the team."

The roles for general and special education teachers are changing in response to rising community and governmental expectations for the education of all students, including students with disabilities, to assume adult responsibilities for work and family in an increasingly global community. Universities are being asked to prepare beginning teachers who are better able to address the diverse educational needs of all students in general education classrooms and curriculum.

Peder Haug (Norway) observed, "Norwegian teachers learn for four years and teach for 40 years. We need to think about what kind of knowledge will serve them for 40 years. Yet policy-makers often think about what kind of knowledge we need for tomorrow. The bottom line is we need to make teachers who think independently and problem-solve collaboratively."

Participant discussion revealed the following:

- The inclusion of students with disabilities in general education is an international trend;
- An essential task confronting personnel preparation programs is how to respond to these reforms in thoughtful ways by increasing the ability of novice and experienced teachers to meet the heterogeneous needs of all children in inclusive, 21st Century schools.
- University personnel preparation programs are challenged to respond to these major educational changes just as these issues are beginning to be examined in empirical research and scholarly literature.

What Kinds of Training in Special Education Should Be Provided to General Education Teachers?

JUTTA BERNDT / GERMANY

My observations are based on the structure and the general conditions in the German school system, mainly that of Berlin, where we have a wide range of possibilities for children with special educational needs within a multi-track system including special education schools and various forms of inclusive education and mainstreaming. There is also variety within the teaching profession. Teachers specialize in instruction in elementary school, high school, grammar schools, vocational schools and special education schools. They all study at the university but differ in their subjects and in their major area of studying.

To begin, when making decisions about training and professional development, we must consider the genuine tasks of teachers:

- They must know how to teach their students.
- They must know how their students learn.
- They must know theories of learning, social behavior and social development, psychology and child development, didactics and teaching methods.
- Above all, they must be educators and models of social manners.

Special education teachers are specialists in children's disabilities. They must understand the fundamentals of pediatrics and child development by knowing the causes of diseases and events that may have led to handicaps. It is their task to accommodate the physical and psychological impact of disabilities in an adequate way. Furthermore, they have to support and advise others who support children's development and education, as well as to assess and describe children's abilities, progress, and development.

Within schools, this is the point where special education teachers and general education teachers must collaborate. They are experts in their fields and have experience with the child whom they are both supporting. The general education teacher is typically less prepared for the participation of a child with disabilities in his class than is desirable or helpful. Therefore, training must be provided to improve readiness and to promote the success of inclusive education. These training areas (described below) include didactics and instructional methods, knowledge, and social attitudes.

Didactics and instructional methods. The main task of this training unit will be to strengthen teachers' competencies in differentiating of students' lessons and assigned projects. By planning lessons cooperatively, general and special education teachers will deepen their mutual understanding and better meet the demands of children with special educational needs. Furthermore, their combined efforts and broader range of teaching methods (e.g., remedial teaching, free learning period) better enables them to cope with diversity and heterogeneity. Team teaching and co-teaching must be practiced for teachers to become accustomed to the practice and to jointly support the children with disabilities as well as those without. Collaborative development and writing of individual educational programs and plans enables the general teacher to understand, modify, and use these while teaching in mainstream settings.

Knowledge. General education teachers should have general knowledge of the laws and rights of people with disabilities, including the official structure and conditions in society. Teachers of mainstreamed students should be able to inform parents about choices

within the school system and to advise them about school professionals, different services for pupils with disabilities, and community support. Their knowledge need not extend to the medical issues of disabilities, for they should not compete with special education teachers nor substitute their work for that of the special education teacher.

Social Attitudes. The most important training deals with values, attitudes, and social competence. It is certainly the area that presents a demanding challenge. General education teachers must learn about their own attitude toward disabilities and handicaps. They need to experience communication with people with disabilities (at least in artificial settings like role-playing). In seminars, discussions must address teaching experiences and ways to communicate and react to situations. All teaching must be done systematically and with reflection. If teachers are not aware of their attitudes toward their students, their behaviors might be based on prejudice and hidden values. Working with children with disabilities demands that teachers know what they are doing and how they can support the pupils to cope with their disabilities in order to lead a "normal" life in society.

These three areas of training for general education teachers are examples of some major life-long learning and professional development issues. Many of these objectives cannot be reached within a single course or seminar, so ongoing training plays an influential role in changing public attitudes towards disability. Schools have an important part to play within that process as they are shaping the beliefs of future generations.

Participants spent hours defining what "better-prepared" meant when describing novice and experienced teachers and generated the following parameters:

- Prepared teachers recognize and understand the needs of students first and shape teaching to fit those needs. In some cases, the learning needs of students may require the use of different instructional strategies; in other cases, the social and emotional needs of students may require that teachers interact with them in sensitive and authentic ways.
- Prepared teachers understand learning and pedagogical principles and practices to ensure they have a thorough understanding of why teaching needs to occur in particular ways for particular students.
- Prepared teachers incorporate a thorough understanding of moral issues related to education, so they become comfortable with and secure in their commitment to the professional values that support teaching.
- Both general and special educators are prepared more broadly, so that they better understand both the general instructional techniques that are useful for large group instruction as well as the specialized practices that address the unique instructional needs of individual students.

- Special education teachers need to be prepared to participate in significant ways in general education classrooms. This led some symposium participants to suggest that special education teachers should be as prepared as general teachers first to better understand the curriculum, so that they could exchange and share roles.
- General and special education teachers must collaborate effectively with their colleagues and nonprofessionals so they can integrate their knowledge and skills to promote student learning in seamless and effective ways.

A Teacher's View of Inclusion

SHERRY HARRISON / UNITED STATES

Even the best-designed school program will fail if the teachers do not believe in and support it. Collaboration between the regular classroom teacher and the special education teacher is essential if inclusion programs are to work. Often, lack of collaboration is the reason general education teachers resist inclusion. The ability to collaborate requires that the teachers and principal have a good working relationship. This relationship is the main component in creating high-performance environments. When regular and special education teachers have no experience working with students with disabilities, misconceptions can abound.

One of the most important lessons that must be learned by a teacher who has never worked with students who have physical, learning, behavioral, or emotional disabilities is that these students, while limited in some areas, frequently have many talents in other areas. For example, the student who is not able to see as well as his classmates may have a wonderfully developed musical ability to share with his class. Another student who has difficulty writing stories may have the ability to draw or paint. It is important for a sense of community to be established in which students are viewed for their strengths rather than their weaknesses.

Most teachers are used to working alone, or being "in charge" of a class. Many teacher preparation courses in the past did not include collaborative teaching skill development. Sharing responsibility is an attribute that must be cultivated and nurtured.

Regular education teachers may be resistant to inclusion because they are often left out of the planning stages. Administrators must ensure that both regular and special educators are involved all stages of program development including planning. Teachers must believe that the benefits of change will be greater than the discomforts that occur from doing new things.

Lack of appropriate staff development about inclusion for regular education personnel is often another reason regular education faculty may be resistant. Staff development and training are among the most powerful tools for reducing the level of anxiety that teachers may feel in

the beginning of an inclusion program. Educators experienced in inclusion should provide this staff development as part of an ongoing process.

An atmosphere or school culture where teachers and administrators feel free to openly discuss how inclusion is working is essential. Regular educators may be resistant to inclusion because they do not feel they will have the freedom to share their concerns about problems and to obtain ongoing support and technical assistance. Teachers and school administrators must openly and honestly discuss their concerns and needs to plan for appropriate training and ongoing professional development.

All good educators want all of their students to succeed, whether or not they have disabilities. In my opinion, many fundamental values differences and concerns about inclusion would not enter into the conversation if teachers felt supported and had what they need for their students to succeed. Over time, teachers gain confidence and realize that they have great ideas to help all students to succeed in school.

Collaborative teaching demands different skills of teachers than is the case for teaching independently. It is just one example of the fundamental changes in teaching practices that are occurring worldwide. The depth of these policy and practice changes towards collaboration often challenges long-held assumptions about teaching, learning, and disability. The sense of urgency to implement effective practices may contribute to unrest and discomfort among the key stakeholders who are grappling with new ways of teaching.

This tension was exemplified when some symposium participants suggested that special education teachers need to support general education teachers by modeling special practices, sharing special education knowledge, and acting as "local experts" on the education of students with disabilities. Others strongly cautioned that special educators must be vigilant to be sure that they do not automatically assume that they have all the answers about children with disabilities. Ellen Brantlinger (U.S.) reminded the symposium participants that many current teachers had been trained to work in separated classrooms, some for students with disabilities and others for students without disabilities. She asked, "How do we teach teachers to unlearn the excluded system that they did well in?"

Doug Biklen (U.S.) extended this further, noting that some discussion presumed the continuation of separate disciplines for general and special education. He asked, "Is this not part of the problem? Is the distinction between general and special education teachers standing in the way of more effective instruction for all learners?"

In most countries, there were both general and special educators who were resistant to the inclusion of students with disabilities in their general education classrooms. Brian McNulty (U.S.) pointed out, "The developmental dilemma is that we have created a mystique for teachers. First, we told teachers that not everyone can teach special education and now we are telling them that we want them to teach general and special education."

GAETANINA VILLANELLA / ITALY

I know many teachers whose competence and commitment have improved because of changing demands in schools and because they have felt that their work is very important both for students and for society. There are also teachers who feel frustrated, because both the central administration and the broader society do not seem to recognize the importance of teachers' work. This is compounded by the cultural "confusion" and social problems of schools with limited resources and with students who come to class with ever-increasing needs. When one considers that teachers are undervalued and underpaid, our profession can seem heavy and difficult in a heavy and difficult world. Our profession carries great responsibility, and teachers need to be supported by adequate policies and resources. Given the complex nature of schooling and the pressures of educational reform, the inclusion of students with special education needs into general education classes should not be seen as the main source of teachers' distress.

Educational reforms need to be designed to meet student, family, teacher, and administrator needs for training, life-long learning, and support. Reforms need to be made within a prescribed time period and with careful monitoring to ensure that these changes are meeting people's teaching and learning needs. Finally, educational reforms should always be grounded in the ideal that education is a fundamental right of all people. Schools have to meet changing demands in a changing world. They cannot justify inadequate responses to people's needs with the argument that teachers are frustrated.

General and special education teachers who oppose integration by arguing that teachers are frustrated by education reform's changing demands often really mean: "I am culturally against the integration and inclusion of students with disabilities but I do not want to admit it." While we must deal with teachers' legitimate frustrations, we must also be aware that sometimes these are excuses used to hide opposition to inclusion.

Many participants felt that teacher competencies involving differentiated instructional strategies must be integral to all teacher education rather just to special education because all teachers are in this together. Representing a university faculty perspective, Simon Haskell (Australia) described the impact of including students with disabilities, "When you make discoveries about how a child with disabilities learns in effective ways, you can apply that in general education. There are things done in inclusive education that shed light on how all children learn. This has elevated our faculty."

University faculty concurred that it is essential for teachers to distinguish between the innovations that advance the goals of education and the fads that are unlikely to enhance teaching and learning in classrooms. University preparation programs share responsibility for preparing teachers to respond thoughtfully and assertively in this era of such rapid and difficult changes.

Barbara LeRoy (U.S.) summarized these beliefs when she said, "If we do not think about improving the entire system and structure, we have missed the opportunity to apply what we have learned from past efforts."

Participants suggested that universities could and should support teachers and schools in the following ways:

- Select candidates with a strong and genuine commitment to quality education.
- Prepare teachers to have strong backgrounds in general education.
- Prepare teachers to be reflective educators by using inquiry in their practice.
- Create teacher induction mechanisms in which novice teachers are guided by experienced mentor teachers.
- Prepare teachers to identify the types of support they require in order to do a good job.

G. Thomas Bellamy (U.S.) summarized these as four fundamental components of initial and ongoing teacher education: content knowledge about what is being taught, pedagogy describing how best to teach it, practical skills for surviving day to day in the classroom, and a vested interest in the moral and character development of children.

Perspectives on University Preservice Preparation Programs and School Inclusion

ELLEN BRANTLINGER / UNITED STATES

First, I must add the caveat that from my experience, both pre-service and experienced special education teachers can be more resistant to inclusion than their general education peers or colleagues. I have this found true in working with pre-service and experienced teachers at both elementary and secondary levels as well as in studies of attitudes about inclusion. Sadly, part of this is due to the fact that special education teachers want to control their teaching by having their own classrooms. They do not want to be "glorified aids" or "second-citizens" in other teachers' classrooms. Most of us were socialized as students in K-12 schooling and at the university to one teacher to one classroom with the teacher being in charge of the situation. As students, we also worked mainly alone. Therefore, the idea of inclusion and co-teaching, with two or more teachers sharing classrooms and students, does not come naturally to us.

In an Indiana University study of co-teaching arrangements between general and special educators in inclusive classrooms, graduate students and I found that most used the lowest levels of co-teaching. These classrooms used instructional arrangements in which the special education teacher worked mostly or only with classified students, other low-achievers, and "bad kids," while the general education teacher did all the instruction and planning for the whole class. Yet, both the general and special education teachers stated that they wanted to share roles evenly–to

teach all children, to rotate being main teacher, to share planning and evaluation. Instead, the teachers found they fell into certain roles based on what both teachers thought was their expertise and the other teacher's expectations of them. In response to these findings, we developed a guide for teachers to use to negotiate and enact more equitable roles and partnerships.

Second, there is a human reality of what any teacher can do. In a follow-up of his book, First Year Teacher, Robert Bullough (1989) details how one teacher, Kerrie, was overwhelmed by the large number of children in an inclusive class in a low-income school that had few resources and a huge class size. She had a number of children with significant disabilities but not sufficient support from special educators or teacher aides. At the end of that school year, Kerrie decided to leave teaching despite a history of 10 years of satisfying teaching in a "better" school with fewer resources and fewer needy children. Teachers need adequate resources to achieve inclusion. There is no pat formula for the ratio of adults to children. However, a trusting, collaborative school needs to provide supports based upon the expressed needs of teachers. I always emphasize to my preservice teachers that they do not need to be "good girls" (most are women) or "super stars" who can handle anything and anybody. Instead, they need to do themselves and their students a favor by demanding adequate supports.

Third, I have always maintained that special education has no magic and that all teachers need to learn how to teach all children effectively. Certainly, specialized skills are required to teach students with low-incidence disabilities (e.g., deafness, blindness). However, I caution that even for children with categorical labels (e.g., traumatic brain injury, autism, or Down syndrome), their personalities and learning characteristics are so diverse that each teacher needs to design instructional techniques to address each child's unique needs rather than the disability classification. When I teach general education preservice teachers, I always reassure them that they can teach widely diverse children successfully if they are flexible and tolerant and really care about each child regardless of his or her rank in the classroom, cultural background, or abilities.

Lastly, attitudes and beliefs are very important–they permeate all our actions. Distinctive belief structures undergird the thinking of supporters of inclusion and the perspectives of supporters of "the cascade" and pull-out special education services (Brantlinger, 1997; Brantlinger, 1996). These belief structures include the following:

- A diverse comprehensive community-oriented classroom is better than a stratified, competitive class.
- All parents care about their children (but some have had negative experiences with schools themselves and so are alienated and rightly suspicious).

- The normative pupil at any grade level is a statistical average and not an ideal achievement level for all children of a chronological age.
- Children construct knowledge from enriched, interesting contexts and dynamic interaction with peers.

Individualized instruction tends to be boring "drill and kill" and is based on the assumption that what we directly teach children, they will learn—something that any experienced teacher can attest is not the case. Extensive individualized instruction is often done in a tedious, stigmatizing way that inhibits rather than enables the learner. Thus, yes, I do believe that fundamental value differences do distinguish fine inclusion teachers from bad ones. I also believe that it is the role of teacher educators (and anybody else who "believes in" inclusion) to work to modify the damaging, excluding attitudes.

Symposium participants noted that university preparation programs could not keep pace with or effectively participate in emerging educational reforms unless they became more immediately involved in the daily work of schools. Many believed that universities need to re-examine their roles if they are not teaching future teachers well. Dianne Ferguson (U.S.) observed, "Universities have not stayed engaged. We need to remain involved with teachers throughout their careers and shift back and forth between theoretical underpinnings and the reality inside their jobs."

Noting a lack of communication between schools and teacher training programs in universities, most participants concurred that there is a lack of trust between the faculty of primary and secondary schools and universities. The federal, state, and provincial school governance bodies involved with administration, finance, teacher certification, and licensure often lament the lack of collaboration, cohesion, and cooperation among their primary, secondary, and tertiary education systems. Tony Davies (New Zealand) described perceptions contributing to this fragmentation, "Universities are highly autonomous and getting them to talk to each other is a major feat. Schools often don't want local universities to train their teachers and instead use private consultants because the schools feel that universities don't necessarily provide relevant skills."

In most nations, university preparation programs have not been directly responsible for the continuing professional development of experienced teachers. Some questioned whether it was possible to differentiate universities' responsibility for the preparation of novice teachers from the responsibility to support the schools into which these teachers would be placed. Participants saw the need to provide continuing education to experienced educators to enable them to assume new and emerging roles created by educational reforms for students with and without disabilities. Multiple perspectives were shared about the potential contributions of university schools of education in these continuing professional development efforts. In several countries, university preparation programs

had become increasingly involved in the provision of in-service training for existing teachers. Linda Blanton (U.S.) explained how her university collaborated with teachers about in-service training: "We developed real teams in real schools addressing real problems."

A great deal of discussion centered on school-university partnerships that are engaged in simultaneous renewal efforts to respond to educational reform and school improvement initiatives. School-university partnerships place university faculty in schools and school faculty in the universities and recognize that important knowledge about education and pedagogy is generated in both settings. These partnerships have the potential to do the following:

- Keep university faculty actively engaged in solving problems related to educational practice.
- Keep school faculty engaged in scholarship by coupling the realities of daily practices in schools with the disciplined scholarship, reflection and inquiry of universities.
- Recognize the inevitable tension existing between the theory taught to teachers and the practice that is required of them.

Necessary Components of Successful Partnership

LINDA BLANTON / UNITED STATES

Two compatible forces have created a rich context for schools, colleges, and departments of education to focus their research mission on the practical and immediate tasks of teacher preparation and school improvement. Over the last twenty years, education has been dominated by reform efforts directed at our nation's public schools and teacher education programs. Consistent in the many reform agendas (e.g., Holmes Group, 1990; National Commission, 1996) is a focus on improved student achievement, a more qualified teaching force, and more formal school-university partnerships. During this same time period, a major shift occurred in the way research is viewed in education. Our field is no longer driven primarily by positivist approaches; it has grown more comfortable with qualitative methods that allow us to answer many of the practical problems we face in schools and teacher education. This is true even in special education, where these changing paradigms have been slower to take hold.

Given the pressure that schools face to show student achievement gains and that teacher education programs face to demonstrate that they produce competent teachers, it seems evident that these issues ought to frame and direct much of the research activity in schools, colleges, and departments of education. School-university partnerships seem to be one of the most effective ways to address these challenges. The concept of the Professional Development Schools (PDS) has been the impetus for many universities throughout the United Stated to formalize their relationships with schools. A component of the reform agenda

of the Holmes Group (1990), PDSs were viewed as central to the redesign of teacher education programs. Although the last decade has brought forth a large body of literature examining and supporting PDSs (e.g., Abdal-Hagg, 1998; Valli, Cooper, & Frankes, 1997), the knowledge base does not yet include much evidence of student achievement gains or teacher education change. Even so, the research base is growing (as evidenced by such projects as the NEA Teacher Education Initiative that is evaluating the success of restructured teacher education programs in seven sites) and the commitment of standards groups is strong (as evidenced by the new NCATE standards for PDSs). With the level of activity currently under way, we should soon see more data to show the strength of school-university partnerships in restructuring teacher education and improving the achievement of students in schools.

The university culture of individualism may not always support movement to the more collaborative expectations of school-university partnerships (Winn & Blanton, 1997). This culture may work not only against the school and university connection but also against the willingness of faculty to work with their colleagues and teachers to explore the practical problems of schools and teacher education. This, then, is a major barrier to acknowledge and eliminate if universities are to shift toward the more relevant and practical tasks in schools and teacher education.

Individualism in universities is revealed in many ways: reward structures, faculty control, philosophical perspectives, and resources. Reward structures for university faculty are not usually set up to provide incentives for collaborative research and program development. In most research institutions, for example, research may weigh far greater than the teaching and service areas for tenure and promotion (Goodlad, 1990). Even in universities where teaching is the primary focus, rewards seem based mostly on one's individual accomplishments. Added to the emphasis on individual accomplishments is the control that faculty have over their professional lives. For example, university faculty typically control their course schedules and content, their research agendas, and most other professional activities. With such control, the faculty is in a position to accept or refuse an agenda set forth by colleagues, a department chair, or a dean.

Faculty members from different disciplines, such as, general and special education, often hold different perspectives about teaching, learning, and even approaching and solving problems. The departmentalized structure of most colleges and schools of education supports the professional isolation and identities of different groups. When faculty members from different disciplines do work together, they sometimes encounter conflict because their philosophical orientations differ and create communication barriers.

Resource allocations are another barrier to school-university partnerships and to cross-department work in universities. In many, if not most, universities, resources are divided along department lines. This sort of division leads naturally to competition for students and resources.

In order to turn these barriers into opportunities, and promote research that is more relevant to the practical and immediate tasks of teacher preparation and school improvement, universities must do the following:

- Choose people for leadership positions in schools, colleges, and departments of education who embrace the goal of school-university partnerships. It is critical that people in leadership roles understand and embrace the concept of collaboration and the importance of school-university partnerships. Likewise, recruit new faculty members who value collaboration and can demonstrate this activity in their former work.

- Consider new organizational structures for schools, colleges, and departments of education. Breaking down structures that support individualism is central to assuring greater communication and collaboration among university faculty members.

- Explore and change reward structures for university faculty. Faculty need to be assured that their time in partnership schools will be recognized and valued. Also, research done in collaboration with other colleagues should be valued in the same way that individual research activities are valued. Further, applied research needs to receive similar weight to that of basic research and both should receive equal support when funds to support them are given out by graduate committees and other groups on campuses.

- Provide ample resources to support the development and maintenance of school-university partnerships. Resources will need to include time for faculty who work in partnership schools, funds to support roles such as teachers-in-residence, and money for travel to partnership sites.

The characteristics of faculty members and of teachers that will be necessary for successful school-university partnerships flow naturally from several of the points made previously. First, both groups must have an interest in solving the challenges of teaching and learning, and of teacher education. They must also see the value of combining the expertise each brings with the resources of schools to work closely with teachers and other school personnel. To understand the challenges of teacher education, teachers and school administrators must be willing to venture outside their school and university settings. Similarly, they must open the doors to their settings.

The willingness to collaborate is an essential characteristic for both teachers and faculty who work in school-university partnerships. Through collaboration, each group may be challenged to assume new roles and responsibilities (e.g., team teaching, jointplanning of programs and courses). By engaging in these new activities, both groups reap

the benefit of excellent professional development.Because successful school-university partnerships include a strong inquiry component, teachers and faculty members must understand how inquiry strengthens their teaching and helps them grow professionally. Faculty may take the lead in assuring that much of this activity is published and presented beyond the local level. Teachers will be engaged in presentation and publication activities that are often the exclusive domain of university faculty.

In summary, the current rich context provides an opportunity for schools and universities to come together to address the practical and immediate tasks of teacher preparation and school improvement. To accomplish this, we will need faculty and teachers who possess an array of characteristics that begin with an interest in solving these challenges and seeing the value of working collaboratively to make it happen.

Notes on School-University Partnerships

G. THOMAS BELAMY / UNITED STATES

Three population trends in more developed countries create extreme pressures for changes in general education, increasing the complexity of efforts to educate children and youth with disabilities in regular schools and classes. First, in many of our countries there is a marked increase in the number of children who live near or below poverty levels and who do not speak the school's language at home. The result is more children who have difficulty learning in traditionally operated schools.

Second, the globalization of the economy and labor market has meant the virtual disappearance of unskilled jobs paying family wages in the more developed countries. The economic demands faced by graduates set a higher standard of achievement for schools to meet with all students, in essence, requiring that all students achieve at levels previously attained by only a few. Third, despite the increasing importance of education in the global economy, an a older voting public in many countries seems more inclined to support public services for the elderly than the young, so that schools face significant financial constraints as they address the competing demands of more diverse students and higher standards for learning.

These three trends create climates of instability and reform in educational institutions and frame new challenges for those working toward the inclusion of individuals with disabilities in ordinary schools. Perhaps because of the international perspectives at this gathering, our conversations considered issues of inclusion from four quite different, but equally important perspectives. First, we often referred to inclusion as a

fundamental value, a view that individuals belong fully in society regardless of social, emotional, intellectual, or physical differences. At this level, our conversation had little to do with matters of educational effectiveness or efficiency, addressing instead what social and institutional circumstances should exist in a just society.

A second perspective evident throughout our conversations focused on the government policies that translate shared beliefs about disability and inclusion into funding, requirements, rights, and sanctions. Our conversation frequently turned to efforts to understand exactly how the policies of our various countries support and inhibit the inclusion of people with disabilities into schools and society and to share the advocacy strategies that were being utilized to influence those policies.

A third perspective in our conversations reflected the particular institutional circumstances within which most of us work—the schools, universities and public and private agencies that support individuals with disabilities and prepare professionals for that service. The structure of these institutions enable some kinds of inclusion while inhibiting others. Naturally, these institutional circumstances differ across our various countries, and a part of the delight at meetings such as this is discovering the possibilities inherent in structures different from our own.

A fourth perspective in our conversation gets to the heart of educational practice—what do professionals, parents, and others actually do to improve the life and range of opportunities for people with disabilities? What works? What should teachers know how to do well? Of course the range of possibilities is affected by the institutional and policy environments within which we work and by the shared values of our communities and cultures.

Depending on local and national circumstances, progress toward inclusive education depends on action related to different ones of these four perspectives. For example, our comments suggested that procedural skill and organizational structures presented the greatest opportunity for change in some countries, while building shared societal values and supportive public policies seemed more important goals in others.

Two salient lessons emerge from this international conversation about the changing pressures on schools and the related perspectives on inclusion. First, teachers, both in general and special education, have been asked to assume increasingly complex responsibilities that require improved initial preparation and ongoing support for professional learning. It seems time to re-think much of the conventional wisdom of teacher education in light of the additional responsibilities that changing demographics and politically-driven reforms have given to teachers. Second, the education and support needed for this teacher learning increasingly depends on school-university partnerships, for, except in very unusual circumstances, neither of these institutions alone has the resources or expertise to effectively prepare and support teachers well. Partnerships are not panaceas, but they may well have become essential components of the support system for teacher learning, on which both inclusion and school renewal depend.

Discussions emphasized the need to create equitable partnerships among school and university faculty so that schools could articulate the skills and competencies they need from novice teachers. Symposium participants were not laboring under the misperception that equity would be easy to construct in these partnerships. For example, Yerker Andersson (U.S.) noted that, "Traditionally teachers, both general and special education, have probably been viewing university faculty more as evaluators than as partners."

A Michigan Example of Collaborative Partnership for Education Reform and Personnel Preparation

BARBARA LEROY / UNITED STATES

In Michigan's Upper Peninsula, Northern Michigan University, Marquette-Alger Intermediate School District, Aspen Ridge Middle School, Whitman Elementary School, and the Developmental Disabilities Institute at Wayne State University have formed a collaborative partnership to implement a learning organization approach to education reform and personnel preparation (Senge, 1990; O'Neil, 1995). This approach, in which teacher preparation and teacher practice are organic and interrelated components, places schools at the center of systemic change in a collaborative, long-term partnership with universities. The goal of this partnership is set within the context of three levels of unification:

- Public School: The unification of general and special education daily practice and inquiry within the general education classroom.
- University: The unification of general and special education personnel preparation and professional development.
- Classroom: The unification of daily practice with personnel preparation and professional development.

Further, this partnership was formed to create reflective practice across all of the above settings. Learning teams were formed within and across the three partners to create both the culture and capacities for a shared engagement and reflection. This reflection focuses on the instruction of all students in the general education classroom and the professional preparation and development of general and special education teachers and faculty.

In this learning organization model, each partner (public school, university, classroom) represents a team that functions within both its unique setting and the larger context of the learning organization. Each team is composed of setting-specific and organization-wide members. Organization-wide members serve as "critical friends" who push the team to deeper levels of inquiry and reflection through the posing of fundamental questions. These critical friends also ensure that

systemic, cross-partner issues remain at the forefront of all team planning and activity implementation.

In this model, university teaching occurs in the schools, allowing all learners to experience daily the multiple realities of education and learning teams . Co-teaching and mentoring occur at all levels simultaneously, with practice continually informed by the learning experiences inherent in such a dynamic environment.

In order for this collaborative partnership to be practical, attractive, and sustaining, it must be results-driven, systems-thinking, and constructivist in its nature (Sparks, 1994). Keeping student outcomes at the forefront of all activities drives the partnership and seeing the results impels the continual striving for deeper and more systemic reflection and innovation. To reach the goals of the learning organization, the collaborative partnership undertakes numerous sustained and practical activities, described below:

Public School Partner Activities

- *Teacher Study Teams:* Teams select and systematically discuss education reform literature at weekly meetings throughout the year.

- *University Student-Teacher Classroom Book Study:* Elementary classrooms and university methods classes study the same children's literature to create joint learning opportunities and activities.

- *Parenting Center:* Parents operated an education, networking, and child care center within the school. The center creates a true sense that the school is at the core of the community and that it serves as a coordinating place for all community activities.

University Partner Activities

- *University Courses Taught Within the Public School Setting:* Teacher preparation classes are taught within the schools to ensure that university education students have access to their "learning laboratory" and professors on a daily basis.

- *Practicing Teachers as University Adjunct Faculty:* University methods courses are taught by practicing teachers from the collaborative public schools. These instructors provide students with authentic instruction based on their daily professional experiences in actual classrooms.

- *University Students as Classroom Supports:* Student teachers, under the supervision of their school-based professors, manage classrooms as an intentional component of their learning experiences. This support allows teachers to be released for weekly study and planning meetings.

Classroom Partner Activities

- *Student-Led Conferences:* Beginning in kindergarten, students develop and present their own learning portfolios, as part of planning, directing, and assessing their academic performance. Portfolio conferences are led by students and held with teachers and families.
- *Students as Researchers:* Math and science students maintain databases of aggregate student academic performance. They prepare quarterly reports, including statistics and graphs, and the language arts classes prepare associated written reports.
- *Community Service Program:* All sixth and seventh-grade students participated in the community service program, which links student learning with community needs and provides students with early exploratory vocational activities.

In addition, Yerker Andersson (U.S.) suggested the change towards university-school partnerships was most likely to occur if the teachers and the university faculty created and examined such partnerships in response to internal rather than external pressures. Symposium participants acknowledged and understood that real school–university partnerships would inevitably lead to changes in the power and authority relationships as well as changes in the policy, practice, and research functions of these education systems. Such changes would be incompatible with some of the existing structures of both agencies and might be opposed by individuals bound by traditional routines and roles. Still, these tensions could prompt needed changes within both systems because the altered power structures, paradigm shifts in thinking, and ruptures of routines could stimulate fundamental and sustainable changes in schooling. Susan Tetler (Denmark) cautioned about the opportunities lost by viewing these experiences as small-scale, isolated "pilot projects" rather than cohesive and sustained initiatives that "go to scale." She said, "These ideas and experiences have passed away little by little, and perhaps, after a while, and independent of the earlier experiences, have arisen again in quite a different place in Denmark. In this way the experiences have only been repeated, instead of being the dynamic starting point for further development."

Brian McNulty (U.S.) offered a similar caution about the sustainability of inclusive schooling efforts, "The thing that worries me is that if we don't work on the structural issues, reform and inclusion will really become a fad."

With the merging of general and special education reform efforts, today's American schools are under increasing pressure to show educational growth across the entire student population. Recent federal and state government mandates require a framework of accountability that emphasizes equal access to learning for all students in the general education curriculum. As a result, the roles of both general and special educators, as well as the skills they bring to the classroom, must allow them to teach students with the wide array of learning abilities evident within schools. Fortunately, the thrust toward inclusion in the past 10 years has laid the foundation for research about promising practices that meet the needs all students within the general education classroom (e.g. McDougall & Brady, 1998; O'Connor & Jenkins, 1986; Salisbury, Wilson, Swartz, Palombaro & Wassel, 1997). The challenge facing teacher educators now is to ensure that this current research makes its way into classroom practice. (Gersten, Morvant, & Brengleman, 1995; Vergason & Anderegg, 1991).

The burden of effective teacher training should not be the duty of universities alone, however. Since compliance with federal mandates rests with state and district agencies, both play a unique and vital role in personnel preparation at the preservice level, as well as in the ongoing professional development of practicing educators. Therefore, these entities are responsible for forming a collaborative, non-traditional partnership to create and sustain the change necessary to enable all educators to be prepared to work with all students. The call for educational systems to forge innovative connections has been noted throughout the literature (Goodlad & Solder, 1992, Kozleski, Sands & French, 1993, Pugach & Pasch, 1992; Thousand & Villa, 1995). Within this systems partnership, state education agencies (SEAs) can serve as a catalyst for change from the administrative to classroom level, and can act to bring efforts to scale across the state.

Although a major function of the state education agency is to monitor school districts' compliance with both federal and state legal mandates, the scope of the work includes creating policy to frame how districts must implement those mandates. According to McNulty, Connolly, Wilson & Brewer (1996) and Schafritz, Koeppe & Soper (1988), policy is a plan that is meant to be the "public articulation of our beliefs or visions," that the government chooses to enact. The reauthorized Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (1997) has paved the way for states and districts to create a unified vision of improved learning for all students. For the first time since the inception of disability legislation, the political agenda for both special and general education has merged. The work of the SEAs now is to collaborate with all stakeholders to create a plan that leads to that end.

The SEA also serves as the gatekeeper for accountability to the public through district accreditation and teacher licensure. The long-range outcome of all these endeavors is to support higher levels of student

achievement through ensuring that classrooms are equipped with qualified educational staff. To guarantee that all students, including those with the most significant disabilities, have access to and learn within the general education curriculum in high-quality, inclusive classrooms, the partnership between agencies will need to address at least two fundamental factors at the state level. These include the creation and support of a single, public accountability system that includes and reports the learning results of all students and the development of teacher licensure programs that no longer reflect a separate, categorical approach to special and general education service delivery.

Additionally, Lipsky and Gardner (1997) suggest that addressing pedagogy, school staffing, and financial issues at the state level will help to blur the lines between general and special education. To achieve this deep, fundamental impact, however, all stakeholders in the partnership will need a voice in the decision-making process and must receive the necessary supports and recognition to embrace such critical shifts in paradigms. Only through such committed, ongoing efforts will inclusive educational practices reach the classroom level.

The question at large then is: How can a partnership promote, strengthen, and sustain systemic efforts toward building high-quality, inclusive schools of the new millenium? In their role of wide-scale leadership, state educational personnel must model strategies that promote a collaborative and collective vision of school improvement. To achieve the common vision of high-quality, equitable and inclusive learning communities for all students in the new millenium, SEAs may want to consider the following activities to foster a responsive and responsible partnership:

- Include university, district, and family representatives in state-level committees to inform policy development that supports high-quality, inclusive educational systems.

- Create collaborative workgroups that include higher education personnel, district- and building-level administration, direct service providers, family members, and students to create guidelines for ensuring that policy is put into effective practice within districts, buildings and classrooms.

- Develop a workgroup including university personnel, field-based practitioners, and family members to develop a process for decision-making about how all students will be included into the general education curriculum and assessment systems.

- Fiscally support initiatives through creative funding vehicles, such as SLIVER grants, between universities and districts to develop preservice and ongoing, embedded professional development structures that

focus on the hands-on implementation of promising instructional strategies to support high-quality, inclusive classrooms.

- Allow state variances to districts or buildings that are seeking to implement innovative methods to meet all student's needs without labeling for compensatory services.
- Provide state training and technical assistance that provide educators with the necessary information, coaching, and resources to inform and change partnership and instructional practices.
- Partner with university personnel to instruct courses in the latest policy development and thinking about practices that support the policy.
- Host state networking symposia that unite higher education personnel, district and building administrative and direct service providers and family members to share what is working, barriers, and possible solutions toward making all schools successful, inclusive learning environments.

Reflections About On-going Professional Development of Experienced Teachers for Ensuring Successful Inclusion

SUSAN TETLER / DENMARK

I am doing classroom research in a school where the school psychologists requested that some new first-grade classroom teachers work as inclusively as possible. The research involved seven teachers and 32 students, six of whom were defined as having mild or moderate learning disabilities. The teachers were provided financial resources as if there were three classes. (I.e., There were always four teachers present at the same time, and they were responsible for three classrooms.) They had excellent financial support. It was amazing, however, how difficult it has been for these teachers to shift to a more inclusive practice, despite their best intentions and support from the leadership of the school and the community.

During this study, it became increasingly evident that we need to reflect thoroughly on the deep-rooted assumptions upon which we base our school learning environments. Including all students is not just a simple question of developing new procedures and routines. Including all students challenges our basic assumptions about the nature of schools, teaching, and learning. There is a need to develop didactics that are broads, elastic and flexible, not only for use by special

educational teachers and researchers, but also by regular teachers and researchers. As inclusion is regarded as a philosophy, intended to pervade the ethos of schools, we need to ally with educational researchers from general pedagogy and psychology to convince them that we share a common cause. On a smaller scale, that is what we are trying to do in the Scandinavian countries for the moment, even if it sometimes is experienced as a Sisyphean labour.

However, the fact that we think in distinct categories in special educational theories forces us into dilemmas and dichotomies. The basic inconsistency between meeting the needs of each student and paying regard to the entire class is in principle impossible to resolve. This inconsistency is eternal in the sense that it is embedded in the idea of inclusion. Different contexts require different solutions, and the tricky task is to keep the conflict alive and not to seek a fundamental solution. This task challenges our way of thinking and requires another vocabulary that more closely agrees with the didactic and pedagogical intentions.

Developing inclusive classrooms requires a pedagogical perspective that accepts the idea that some students require general education, while others require special education. That means that support is not earmarked for the students with disabilities, but is allocated the entire class, based on a pedagogical assessment of which kind of resources (e.g., financial, structural, or cultural) are necessary to embrace all students.

Meeting the diverse needs of students requires a new role for teachers, as they become part of a team that shares the responsibility for all students in planning, implementing, and cooperating with parents. The special educational qualifications are not considered as superfluous, but as part of the joint qualifications of the team.

Teachers need to reflect thoroughly on their assumptions and hold them up to their own practice. They need to plan in a far-sighted and consistent manner, but at the same time react and be flexible in the moment in order to interconnect all the students' interests, needs, experiences, and potentials. Teachers require courage and creativity to go beyond the boundaries of tradition. They need a broad perspective and creativity in order to develop classrooms that are able to meet each student's needs. Therefore, training must occur close to the practice of the teachers and educators involved, alternating between courses with specific content and those with systematic supervision where exchange of experiences is essential.

Many participants believed that changes toward more inclusion of students with disabilities would best occur through a policy, administrative, or regulatory mandate. Yerker Andersson (U.S.) pointed out that this was part of a larger responsibility for governments to assure the accessibility of schools, noting that full inclusion was mean-

ingful, "only provided that the local, regional, and national governments have ensured that every school is fully accessible for children with disabilities." Participants viewed inclusion as one example of ongoing comprehensive educational reforms in which stakeholders work to improve education simultaneously from the "bottom up" and from the "top down" via coordinated state policies that support change at the local level. Consensus emerged that inclusion needs to be grounded in systems thinking and that no one aspect of education can be changed in isolation. Component parts at federal, state, and district levels must be in alignment if the system is to improve schools and students' learning.

"Partnerships need to be very broad between parents of children with or without disabilities, as well as between parents and children of different religions, race, and so on. Disabilities should not be singled out."

Doug Biklen (U.S.)

Participants pointed out the need for educational systems to secure better resources for teachers to help them meet the needs of all their students. R. Gonggrijp (Netherlands) pointed out, "Teachers are quite willing to help children with disabilities but feel they are not prepared to meet their needs in addition to the needs of 28 'other' students."

Italy provided one example of a national policy mandate supporting resources for inclusion. Gaetanina Villanella (Italy) explained, "In Italy, if a disabled child is in the classroom, class size is reduced and an additional professional is in the room, resulting in a 10:1 ratio. Small class size and increased teacher interaction– these make a more welcoming environment for students with disabilities." She added, "It is evident that teachers need to be trained to make these adaptations work in this way. You need a different strategy as well as a different training methodology."

Even without top-down legislative and policy mandates, others believed that administrative leadership is the key to attitudinal change. Ellen Brantlinger (U.S.) framed this within the broad relationship between national, state, and local structures across social systems. She observed, "Educational systems are the major non-family source of socialization of children for adulthood and should make sure that the practices of school personnel and the structures of schooling are consistent with democratic values and goals.

R. Timm Vogelsberg (U.S.) viewed changes in structure and attitudes as interdependent and noted that the implementation of inclusive policy and practice is essential for attitudinal change to occur.

Participants in the symposium shared a common view that students and their families are at the heart of the efforts to improve schools and their beliefs should be emphasized when changing educational practices. In some cases, because attention remained focused on the students, anticipated difficulties never emerged. Zuhy Sayeed (Canada) offered a parental perspective. "Not only are we talking about a school community," she said, "but a school culture as well. We need to examine who makes decisions and how these decisions are made in schools. I was told my son would be included in elementary, but junior high school would be very difficult. In reality, it happened beautifully." She went on to describe how junior high school teachers had worked closely with her to meet her son's special needs through inclusion.

The participation of parents also proved critical in Hungary. Beatta Dezsi (Hungary), a young woman who uses a wheelchair, offered her insights. "I was in a special institution for five years. My mom wanted me to go to nor-

mal primary school, but teachers worried about things like if they gave me bad marks I might cry. The teachers were kind and worked together with my mom and made sure that they tried to provide the things I needed."

Symposium participants shared a common belief that policies and practices were needed to strengthen the communication between students, students' families and their schools. Essentially, this was another form of partnership that contributed to the power of students with disabilities and their families. For example, in Switzerland, an advisory group of parents and teachers of students with disabilities met regularly to discuss policies and practices that would align schools with familial expectations. Full participation by students and families in educational decision-making and program implementation benefits both students and the school community. Students gain invaluable practice in self-determined participation in making decisions made about their lives, and schools gain new insight into the needs of students and ways to meet these needs. Doug Biklen (U.S.) added, "Partnerships need to be very broad between parents of children with or without disabilities, as well as between parents and children of different religions, race, and so on. Disabilities should not be singled out."

Also discussed were examples of the missed opportunities that result when students and families are not active partners. A memorable moment in the symposium occurred when Xu Yun (China) used a sheet of paper to illustrate a "cone of services" for people with disabilities. At the tip of the cone, he placed the professionals and expert service providers who supported students with disabilities. At the base of the cone, he placed the students themselves and their families. Xu noted that the cone was far more stable if set on its family base, and not balanced on the expectations of the professionals at the tip. Xu's paper cone served as a metaphor for education's shift from school-centered to family-centered educational services.

Partnerships between families, schools, and adults with disabilities further enriched the capacity of communities to meet the needs of students with disabilties. Yerker Andersson (U.S.) added, " We need to involve people with disabilities in groups that are implementing the changes. We need adult educators with disabilities who are products of the educational system. We need to draw from their experience to develop new techniques." He pointed out that each of these partnerships could provide enriched perspectives on the educational restructuring needed to serve students with and without disabilities.

Representation of People with Disabilities in Educational Policy-Making

YERKER ANDERSSON / UNITED STATES

In virtually all countries, policies for general education have tended to be designed to meet the requirements of national, regional, or local governments or legislatures and have been shaped by parents and dominate cultural traditions. Educational policy development has traditionally been in the domain of assigned "experts," including school administrators, university professors, and government officials. These policy-makers have, no doubt, considered their own elementary and secondary school experiences. Alumni organizations, adult communities,

parents with disabilities, architects and mass media also have relied on their own elementary and secondary school experiences in their attempt to influence educational policies. Classroom teachers usually are responsible for implementing such policies, again relying on their own school experiences for guidance. Therefore, past elementary and secondary school experiences must have played major factors in this process of developing, reviewing, or accepting school policies or facilities for general education.

In most countries, national governments have tended to rely on experts in several areas such as special education, medicine, rehabilitation, and psychology for special education policy development. This multi-disciplinary approach may require the experts to have some understanding of the educational and social needs of children with disabilities. However, these experts have historically lacked a working knowledge of adults with disabilities, including parents and their organizations. The past school experiences of local or regional government officials or of the parents of children with disabilities are often inapplicable to reviews or evaluations of existing special education policies or proposed architectural modifications. Unlike teachers, individuals with disabilities and their families have not been involved in the development or implementation of educational policies. As long as the school facilities are inaccessible, these individuals have not been able to meet with their children's teachers in school. The elementary and secondary school experiences of adults with disabilities and the parents of children with disabilities have rarely been taken into consideration. In effect, the influence of alumni on special education is severely minimized, when compared with the influence of alumni on general education.

In short, a successful implementation of inclusion requires not only the application of equality in both admission to school and full participation in school activities, but also the cooperation among policy-makers and program implementers, parents of children with disabilities, alumni with disabilities, parents with disabilities, architects, and government officials in the process of developing, reviewing, and adopting policies and physical facilities, regardless of whether they are designed for general education, for special education, or for both. Such partnerships should emerge at every level, neither upwards nor downwards, but on a local, regional, and national level. Of course, educational policies and facilities must follow national or country-wide standards.

Rosangela Berman-Bieler (Brazil) provided an example of family participation in educational changes in a program in Brazil. Staffed by people with disabilities, the Independent Living Center informed families and parents of the potential that inclusion held for their children. The adults with disabilities provided role models of independent, self-

advocating people with disabilities whom the children and their families could emulate. Moreover, having experienced many of the difficulties posed by living with a disability, the adults acted as mentors and advocates, assisting the students and their families in securing the resources and services that they required.

Discussions of the need to include children with disabilities in general education quickly ventured into discussions of the need to include children with disabilities more broadly throughout communities, and relatedly, to integrate services provided by other community agencies into schools' service programs. Shifts toward inclusive services often affect more than schools and educational agencies. Susan Peters (U.S.) described the need to include multiple agencies in decisions regarding education services and spoke of her experiences in Africa. She notes, "In Zimbabwe, all decisions about people with disabilities are made in the Ministry of Health, but the Ministry of Education should have a voice. Inclusion involves both the medical community and the education community."

Symposium participants envisioned partnerships between schools and medical facilities, schools and mental heath services, and schools and adults with disabilities. Drawing upon his experiences, Xu Yun (China) pointed out, "Policies in mental health may inform other policies and vice versa." It quickly became apparent that this was no longer a discussion exclusively about students with disabilities.

How Will School Inclusion of Children with Disabilities Affect Others in the Community?

XU YUN / CHINA

Since 1990, we have been working together to strengthen communities and schools in Hangzhou, China. We believe that we live in a society that creates enough abundance for all people to live well. We believe that people can build good communities and schools, care for one another, and live lives of productivity and enjoyment if we study our surroundings and decide how to realize this vision. We come together to work toward these ends.

Our goal is to contribute to communities that have these characteristics:

- Good jobs that pay good wages.
- Schools that empower, excite, and stimulate the learning and development of all children together.
- Diverse people who learn, work, play, and celebrate together, including the community's most vulnerable members.
- Emotional, fiscal, and resource support for individuals, families, and the community.
- Sharing, commonality, trust, and enjoyment of one another.
- Connections and partnerships with other communities that engage

power structures that affect the lives of families, individuals, and the total community.

Members of the community and local faculty serve as a Steering Committee for our work. We work collaboratively and democratically to build partnerships among diverse people and organizations. Some of our work is funded; some occurs through volunteer efforts and the linking of our existing resources.

First, community inclusion service systems for children with disabilities were established. Hangzhou, China, has fully used the urban-rural three-level network of health services to develop community inclusion by helping most children with special needs in local grassroots services efforts. Moreover, under the leadership of local governments at different levels, community inclusion-leading groups have been founded. They consist of public health departments, civil administration departments, disabled persons federations, and other relevant departments that coordinate and cooperate with one another to formulate community rehabilitation plans and manage their implementation.

This leading and coordinating group is seeking to do the following:

- Link resources and energies of individuals in local neighborhoods and communities with schools in a collaborative effort to build inclusive communities in our society.
- Build proactive initiatives that strengthen schools and communities through volunteer and funded efforts.
- Engage in action research, study, and dialogue to understand community challenges and work toward solutions.
- Provide training and technical assistance to support organizations, schools, neighborhoods, families, and individuals.
- Advocate for policy and practices that strengthen community, social justice, and effective schooling.
- Focus efforts related to individuals and families who experience isolation, segregation, and oppression, including people with disabilities and their families.

Schooling provides an opportunity to create a bond with parents and the community. Meaningful involvement on the part of parents and other community members can make children's educational experiences more dynamic and effective. Family and community involvement offers numerous benefits, including increased student

achievement, better student behavior, stronger family bonds, and an increase in acceptance of diverse students on the part of teachers. Such collaboration is related to implementation of effective inclusive education in which education offers schools and communities an opportunity to enrich children with cooperation and problem-solving skills, and an opportunity to learn to respect individual differences. Inclusive education can teach children to respect diversity among their peers, while providing a wonderful foundation for adults to work cooperatively with one another to improve their community.

Finally, the school understands that it is a central community institution, at best the center of the life of the community. As the larger community is engaged in multiple efforts to build and strengthen itself, educators and students are involved integrally in such a process. This can take many forms. Most centrally, as the school uses the local community as its focal point for learning objectives and activities, students study the resources and needs of their community and may engage in learning projects that help to strengthen the community. For example, high school students may study transportation issues in their community, linking the disciplines of social studies, mathematics, and language as they interview people needing transportation; analyze the costs of various transportation options; and present their findings at the city transportation advisory council. Elementary students may learn about different people from different cultures in their community by visiting local cultural centers and interviewing each other's families.

Schools also use their facilities to house and sponsor numerous community events and connections such as local meetings of various groups, events for children and families, sites to link school and human services. Such schools function as community centers where learning and education are a natural part of the total community. Some impacts have been found through this way.

Who benefits from the inclusion of children with disabilities?

Children with Disabilities

- They are spared the effects of separate, segregated education including the negative effects of labeling and the negative attitudes fostered by a lack of contact with typically developing children.
- They are provided with competent models that allow them to learn new adaptive skills and learn when and how to use their existing skills through imitation.
- They are provided with competent peers with whom to interact and thereby learn new social and communicative skills.
- They are provided with realistic life experiences that prepare them to live in the community.
- They are provided with opportunities to develop friendships with typically developing peers.

Children Without Disabilities

- They are provided with opportunities to learn more realistic and accurate views about individuals with disabilities.
- They are provided with opportunities to develop positive attitudes toward others who are different from themselves.
- They are provided with opportunities to learn altruistic behaviors and when and how to use such behaviors.
- They are provided with models of individuals who successfully achieve despite challenges.

Communities

- They can conserve their early childhood resources by limiting the need for segregated specialized programs.
- They can conserve educational resources if children with disabilities who are mainstreamed at the preschool level continue in regular elementary school rather than in special education placements.

Families of Children with Disabilities

- They are able to learn about typical development.
- They may feel less isolated from their communities.
- They may develop relationships with families of typically developing children who can provide them with meaningful support.

Families of Children Without Disabilities

- They may develop relationships with families who have children with disabilities and thereby contribute to them and their communities.
- They will have opportunities to teach their children about individual differences and accepting people who are different from them

Creating and maintaining partnerships around essential systems like health, education, and social service is difficult, time-consuming, and personally challenging. Ensuring that all members of a society have the opportunity to lead valued lives requires collaborative problem-solving by these multifaceted and interdependent systems. Participants in the symposium recognized that it is time-consuming to align policies and practices and build the personal relationships that support partnerships, and these tasks are often not recognized by agencies, schools, or universities as necessary staff responsibilities. Often a partnership's agenda must be renegotiated multiple times as each new partner is added. In many cases, coherent policy alignment must occur at all levels of governance before true partnerships can flourish at the level of practice. While systems are in the throes of negotiating such complex partnerships, the focus of attention may shift away from the needs of children with disabilities and their families. Finally, as Beth Doll (U.S.) noted, "The hardest part of these partnerships is allowing for the possibility that other parties' fundamental values and beliefs may be different from ours."

The External Perspective

Dr. James Banks (U.S.) framed his concluding remarks by emphasizing the importance of situated perspectives, in which the position of any group is always relative to the cultural perspectives of the surrounding community. He then drew parallels between the inclusion of students with disabilities and the quest for equity and excellence in educating students from diverse non-dominant cultural groups. In pursuit of inclusion, he advised, we need to construct terms with agreed-upon meanings. Throughout the symposium discussions, many critical terms held very different meanings for different participants. Dr. Banks observed that it was not always clear whether we were trying to educate students to fit into the existing structures of schools or whether we were trying to transform education to fit the students being educated. Clearly, the latter is the necessary purpose of work. He suggested that inclusion may have two distinct meanings: a way of thinking and a process that is never-ending and that can trigger total school reform to benefit all children. In either sense, inclusion is a process that occurs as part of the educational experience, rather than an end-goal that results from education. In the same way that equality, in principle, will never happen, the inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education curriculum is a work-in-progress that requires ongoing vigilance and continuous improvement.

Critical Questions That Emerged

It was never the intent of this symposium to resolve all important questions related to the preparation of educators. Instead, we sought to identify and clearly articulate those questions that should guide future discussions and frame ongoing efforts to support inclusive policies and practices. These 27 questions describe provocative but critical issues that will stimulate further discussion.

1. What supports do teachers need during this period of rapid change?

2. What new skills must teachers have to meet the challenge of student diversity?

3. Should training in special education be differentiated from that provided to general education teachers? If so, how?

4. How much preparation and what kinds of preparation in special education should be provided to general education teachers?

5. How can teachers be helped to become deliberate and reflective in their teaching?

6. How can teachers' instructional design and delivery be made more sensitive to the needs of children?

7. What kinds of supports do experienced general education teachers require in order to successfully include students with disabilities in the general education classrooms?

8. How can special education teachers be prepared with the skills they need to support general education teachers and others who are including students with disabilities in the general education curriculum?

9. How can educators learn from those teachers, schools, and community systems that are effectively implementing inclusive practices?

10. What characteristics of teachers adequately predispose them to work as effective team members in their schools?

11. How can teachers be prepared and supported to work more effectively in teams?

12. Is the general and special educators' resistance to inclusion due to limited resources, limited preparation to implement inclusion,

limited personal support, or rejection of the fundamental values underlying it?

13. Is it necessary or effective for administrative or governmental rules to be established that require inclusion in order for inclusive practices to become widespread?

14. How can school-university partnerships be practical and attractive to both universities and schools given the different daily routines and incentive structures that exist in both agencies?

15. How can we attract universities and schools into these partnerships in those instances when tensions and mutual criticisms prevented the two from working together?

16. What characteristics of faculty members and of teachers are necessary for successful school-university partnerships?

17. What functions are legitimately functions of the partnerships? What functions of schools and of universities must continue to be vested only in the separate institutions?

18. How can the work that is done within school-university partnerships be generalized to the many schools that are not in such partnerships?

19. How can these school-university partnerships assume greater responsibility for the continuing professional development of teachers, when this task has become so exclusively the responsibility of schools?

20. How can schools come to share the university's responsibility for research, so that educational inquiry will become more relevant to, and grounded in, the practical and immediate tasks of teacher training and school improvement?

21. How can professionals recognize the power of students with disabilities within these partnerships?

22. How can attention be focused on the commonalties among students with and without disabilities and commonalties of their families?

23. How can students with disabilities be better included in the preparation and induction of novice teachers and the ongoing professional development of experienced teachers?

24. What impact will inclusive schools have on other agencies and service providers in the community?

25. What will inclusive schools demand from other agencies in the community?

26. How can the values conflicts be resolved when community members do not believe that inclusion is in the best interest of students with disabilities?

27. What complexities may arise when previously separate agencies attempt to collaborate?

ELLEN BRANTLINGER / UNITED STATES

Perspectives on University Preservice Preparation Programs and School Inclusion

References

Brantlinger, E.A. (1997). Using ideology: Cases of nonrecognition of the politics of research and practice in special education. *Review of Educational Research,* 67, 425-459.

Brantlinger, E.A. (1996). The influence of preservice teachers' beliefs about pupil achievement on attitudes toward inclusion. *Teacher Education and Special Education,* 19, 17-33.

Bullough, R. (1989). First year Teacher. *New York: Teacher's College Press.*

LINDA BLANTON / UNITED STATES

Necessary Components of Successful Partnership

References

Abdal-Hagg, I. (1998). *Professional development schools: Weighing the evidence.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press Inc.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990). *Teachers for our nations schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools.* East Lansing, MI: Author.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future.* New York: Author.

Valli, L., Cooper, D., & Frankes, L. (1997). Professional development schools and equity: A critical analysis of rhetoric and research. In M. W. Apple (Ed.), Review of research in education (pp. 251-304). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

Winn, J., & Blanton, L. (1997). The call for collaboration in teacher education. In L. P. Blanton, C. C. Griffin, J. A. Winn & M. C. Pugach (Eds.), *Teacher education in transition: Collaborative programs to prepare general and special educators* (pp. 1-17). Denver: Love Publishing Company.

BARBARA LEROY / UNITED STATES

A Michigan Example of Collaborative Partnership for Education Reform and Personnel Preparation

References

O'Neill, J. (1995). On schools as learning organizations: A conversation with Ted Sizer. *Educational Leadership,* 52, 4-9.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline.* New York: Doubleday.

Sparks, D (1994). A paradigm shift in staff development. *Education Week,* 42,

JANET FILBIN / UNITED STATES

Preparing Educators for the New Millenium: Creating Responsive and Responsible Partnerships

References

Gersten, R., Morvant, M., & Brengelman, S. (1995). Close to the classroom is close to the bone: Coaching as a means to translate research into classroom practice. *Exceptional Children,* 62, 52-66.

Goodlad, J.I., & Soder, R. (1992). School-university partnerships: An appraisal of an idea. Occasional Paper No. 15, Center for Educational Renewal. Seattle: University of Washington, College of Education.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997, P.L. 105-17, 105th Congress, 1st session.

Lipsky, D.K., & Gartner, A. (1997) National overview of inclusive education. In D.K Lipsky & A. Gartner (Eds.) *Inclusion and school reform: Transforming America's classrooms* (pp.99-116). Baltimore, MD: Paul Brookes Publishing Co.

Kozleski, E., Sands, D., & French, N. (1993). Preparing special education teachers for urban settings. *Teacher Education and Special Education,* 16, 14-22.

McDougall, D. & Brady, M.P., (1998). Initiating and fading self-management interventions to increase math fluency in general education classes. *Exceptional Children,* 64(2), 151-166.

McNulty, B.A., Connolly, T.R., Wilson, P.G., & Brewer, R.D. (1996). LRE policy: The leadership challenge. *Remedial and Special Education,* 17(3), 158-167.

O'Connnor, R.E. & Jenkins, J.R. (1996). Cooperative leanring as an inclusion strategy: A closer look. *Exceptionality.* 6(1), 29-51.

Pugach, M.C., & Pasch, S. H. (1992, April). *The challenge of creating urban professional development schools.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Salisbury, C.L., Wilson, L., Swartz, T., Palombaro, M. & Wassel, J. (1997). Using action research to solve instructional challenges in inclusive elementary school settings. *Education and Treatment of Children,* 20(1), 21-39.

Thousand, J.S., & Villa, R.A. (1995). Managing complex change toward inclusive schooling. In R.A. Villa & J.S. Thousand (Eds.), *Creating an inclusive school* (pp. 51-79). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Shafritz, J., Koeppe, R., & Soper, E. (1988). *The facts on file dictionary of education.* New York. Facts on File.

Vegason, G.L., & Anderegg, M.L. (1991). Beyond the regular education initiative and the resource controversy. *Focus on Exceptional Children,* 23, 7-15.

Yerker Andersson
Professor Emeritus
Gallaudet University
United States

Syed Asghar
Office of Special Education and
Rehabilitative Services
U. S. Department of Education
United States

Serge Averbouh
Inspecteur de l'Education Nationale
Ministere de l'Education Nationale
Direction de Enseignement Superieur
France

James Banks
Center for Multicultural Education
University of Washington
United States

Tom Bellamy
Dean, School of Education
University of Colorado - Denver
United States

Roseangela Berman-Bieler
Center for Independent Living of Rio
de Janeiro
United States and Brazil

Jutta Berndt
Senatsverwaltung Fii Schule, Jugend
und Sport
Germany

Doug Biklen
School of Education
Syracuse University
United States

Dora Bjarnason
Associate Professor
Icelandic College of Education
Iceland

Linda Blanton
Director, School of Education
James Madison University
United States

Esteban Bossi
Fundacion Claudina Thevenet
UNICEF Argentina
Argentina

Ellen Brantlinger
Professor
Indiana University
United States

Jutta Berndt
Landeschulamt
Germany

Jale Colzkoglu
Educatic al Counselor
Turkish Embassy Office, Washington, DC
Turkey

Anthony (Tony) Davies
Senior Policy Analyst
Ministry of Education
New Zealand

Lucia De Anna
Membro Del Comitato Scientifico Dell'
Osservatorio
Permanente Sull' Handicap – Ministero
Publica Istruzione
Italy

Beata (Betty) Aliz Dezsi
Hungary

Imrene Dezsi
Hungary

Diana Lopez Charreton
Subdirectora De Operation
Pubuc Education Secretary
Mexico

Beth Doll
Associate Professor, School of Education
University of Colorado - Denver
United States

Josefina Duran
Counterparts, Inc.
Phoenix, AZ
United States

Peter L. Evans
Head of Study
OECD
France

Isabel Farha
Office of the Secretary of Public Education
Mexico

Dianne Ferguson
Associate Professor, College of Education
University of Oregon
United States

Janet Filbin
Colorado Department of Education
United States

Michael Flanagan
Divisional Inspector of Schools
Department of Education and Science
Ireland

Wayne Fox
Director, UAP of Vermont
University of Vermont
United States

Valerie French
Vice President, Teacher Development Initiative
National Board for Professional Teaching Standards
United States

Stacey Gengel
School of Education
University of Colorado - Denver
United States

Mark Goldfarb
Office of Special Education Programs
U.S. Department of Education
United States

Rinske Gonggrijp
Ministry of Education, Culture and Science
The Netherlands

Helen Berg Gonzalez
Office of the Minister of Education
Republica de Argentina

Ernest Hairston
Office of Special Education Programs
U.S. Department of Education
United States

Sherry Harrison
Director of Exceptional Children Programs
Montgomery County Schools
United States

Simon Haskell
Professor Emeritus, Deakin University
Australia

Peder Haug
Volda University College
Norway

Frode Hauge
Royal Ministry of Education, Research and Church Affairs
Norway

Carol Ironrope Herrera
Parent and Advocate for Children and Families
Pine Ridge, South Dakota
United States

Judith Hollenweger
University of Zurich
Institute for Special Education
Switzerland

Marie L. Keefe
Counterparts, Inc.
Cabin John, MD
United States

Lily Khoo
Teacher of Hearing Impaired
Ripas Hospital
Brunei

Joanna Kosmalowa
Institute of Physiology and Pathology of Hearing
Poland

Doris Leckie
Counterparts, Inc.
Washington, DC
United States

Barbara LeRoy
Director, Developmental Disabilities Institute
Wayne State University
United States

Jennifer Lien
School of Education
University of Colorado - Denver
United States

Gerald (Jerry) Mager
School of Education
Syracuse University
United States

Phyllis R. Magrab
Director, Child Development Center
Georgetown University
United States

Gail Mc Gregor
Project Director, Rural Institute on Disabilities
University of Montana
United States

Brian Mc Nulty
Adams County School District
Commerce City, CO
United States

Ray Miner
Office of Special Education Programs
U.S. Department of Education
United States

Cappie Morgan
Fifth International Congress Coordinator
Counterparts, Inc.
Cabin John, MD
United States

Ray Myers
Office of Educational Technology
U. S. Department of Education
United States

Toshiro Ochiai
Professor, Section Chief
The National Institute of Special Education
Japan

Susan Peters
Michigan State University
United States
Melissa Price
School of Education
Syracuse University
United States

Marleen Pugach
Professor, Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction
University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee
United States

Zuhy Sayeed
Chairperson, International Committee
Canadian Association for Community Living
Canada

Sambia Shivers-Barclay
Office of Special Education Programs
U.S. Department of Education
United States

Anne Smith
Education Research Analyst
Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)
U.S. Department of Education
United States

Kjell-Arne Solli
Associate Professor
Ministry of Education, Research and Church Affairs
Norway

Hashem Taqi
Director General
Kuwait Society for the Handicapped
Kuwait

Susan Tetler
Assistant Professor
Royal Danish School of Educational Studies
Denmark

Vernice M. Thompson
Conference Manager
Georgetown University Child Development Center
United States

Mary S. Thormann
Educational Consultant, New Delhi (ID)
Department of State
United States and India

Aida Topuzyan
Deputy Minister
Ministry of Education and Science
Republic of Armenia

Stanley Trent
Assistant Professor, Special Education
University of Virginia
United States

Jerrie Ueberle
Global Interactions, Inc.
Phoenix, AZ
United States

Suzanna Vekerdy
Director, Children's Rehabilitation Center
Leader of the Hungarian Community Integration Team
Hungary

Gaetanina Villanella
ITC Charles Darwin - Rome (State Technical School)
Italy

R. Timm Vogelsberg
Executive Director, Rural Institute
University of Montana
United States

Judy Winn
Department of Exceptional Education
University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee
United States

Xu Yun
Vanderbilt University
Republic of China

Lucille A. Zeph
Center for Community Inclusion
University of Maine
UnitedStates

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OSERS/OECD
International Symposium on
Inclusion and Professional
Development